

A SHORT
DISCOURSE
AGAINST
TRANSUBSTANTIATION:
OR, AN

Answer to the Ordinary Question, *Whether a man may be saved in the Roman Catholick Religion?*

By the Reduction of it to another, *Whether one can be saved, who Apostatizing from a true Religion, joineeth himself with the grossest Idolaters?*

Where the Evidence against *Transubstantiation*, from Revelation, Reason, and Sense, is repeated and improved, in two Sermons on Mat. 26. 26.

By J. C. D. D.

Nulli dubium esse potest, si nihil in Eucharistia præter panem sit, quàm tota Ecclesia. — Idololatra parit, ac prinde quotquot ante nos hoc Sacramentum adoraverunt, omnes ad unum esse damnatos; nam creaturam panis adoraverunt Creatoris loco. Rossensis contra Oecolamp. lib. 1. cap. 2.

1 Cor. 6. 9. Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the Kingdom of God, — neither Idolaters, nor Adulterers.

Rev. 21. 8. Idolaters and all liars shall have their part in the Lake which burns with fire and brimstone.

London, Printed for Tho. Parkhurst, 1675.

155 (17)



To his highly Honoured
Friend, John Haws Doctor
of Physick.

YOU I think (Sir) know me
too well, to judg that by the
Publication of these two Sermons I
design anything of name to my self,
or thought to supply any vacuity in
the World. I am so well acquainted
with Books as to know there are
Treatises enough in the World on
this Argument, and that nothing
new can be said in it. What can be
said after so many learned holy Men,
and many of them disputing for their
lives? Yet the most of what they have
said is either in Latin, which all
understand not, or in great Volumns
which every Purse will not reach,
and for the most part mixed with
other Heterogeneous Arguments.

The Real Presence not of Christ

A 2

only

The Epistle Dedicatory.

only, but the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament is now made a Theam for every Coffee-house. I thought those that understood not Latin, nor how to take an Argument out of a long Dispute, nor could lay out four or five Shillings, might possibly spare Four-pence or Six pence for a little Vade mecum in the case. But, Sir, this was not all. About a year and a half since a Stranger came to me, but such a one whose Parents, Family, and Education I very well knew to be as averse as is imaginable to Popery, (when he had once told me what he was, to be satisfied in this Question, Whether one might not be saved in the Romish Catholick Religion? Being startled at the fruit of a Branch from such a Root, I craved leave before I directly spake to his Question, to intreat him to tell me, What temptation he could have to such a thought? He began the usual harangue of the Antiquity and Unity of that Religion. I
askt

- The Epistle Dedicatory.

askt him if he had been bred a Schollar
or had travelled? He denying both; I
quickly stopt his mouth as to those pleas,
telling him they were both false, but if
true, they could be to him no Argument,
because he could have no evidence of
them; and therefore he did but trifle
with me. I told him we were upon a Que-
stion concerning Eternal Salvation, and
it became him to be serious. He then told
me, He could never go to Meetings with
his friends, but was perswaded of the
truth of the Arminian points, and found
that the Church of Rome better agreed
with them than the Doctrines of the
Church of England. I told him, All of
that Church embraced them not, though
in that I thought he spake truth. This,
Sir, made me remember, the Sovereign
Drug, the Father Rector long since told
us they had planted in England, (the
vertue of it, it seems, was to purge us of
the Protestant Religion). Coming to the
Question I freely told him, If he un-
derstood his Question of one who had
been bred in a knowledg of the Scrip-
tures

The Epistle Dedicatory.

tures, and under the free Preaching of the Gospel, and apostatized to Popery, my opinion was, Such a one, so living and dying, could not be saved. He, as I hear since, resolved to venture it, I foresaw I should be judged *Durus pater Apostatarum*, and therefore thought myself a little concerned to justify myself as to that sentence. If Apostatizers to gross Idolaters so dying cannot be saved, surely they cannot. This gave the first rise to my thoughts of Printing these popular Discourses, Preached more than a year and half since. That the World saw them no sooner is none of my fault, though it will possibly be a just admiration to you Sir, why (especially in such a time) the publication should be hindered, by any who would be thought the only enemies to Popery. I will assure you, Sir, there is not a line altered, no not a word from what they were when first offered for the Press. Besides, Sir, you know what a cry is made as if Non-con. were rather favourers of Popery, than adversaries to it, & none of them would either preach

The Epistle Dedicatory.

or write against it. It is not ingenuous to hold their hands, and then to cry they will not write. At length it breaks through to help to stop that clamour. You Sir, are so well versed in things of Religion, as to know, that there is no ground to suspect them of favouring Popery, who are fixed in these Doctrines.

1. That every private Christian hath a judgment of private practical discretion, and cannot do ought which his Conscience tells him is sin, nor believe as the Church believeth, meerly because it so believes.

2. That our Justification before God is through the Righteousness of Christ reckoned to us for Righteousness, not for any works of our own, either done before or after Regeneration.

3. That justifying Faith is not a bare assent to a Proposition, but a receiving Christ as Priest, Prophet and King, and a fiducial adherence to him, & him only.

4. That though there be a Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament, yet there is no Real Presence of the Flesh
and

The Epistle Dedicatory.

and Blood of Christ there, further than as in the Signs. These things, Sir, you know, Non-con. generally hold. When these things, Sir, had encouraged me to publish these Sermons, I saw another advantage I might have, by Entituling you to them, once in my life to prescribe to him who hath so often prescribed to me. and mine; not that Sir, I think you need any such antidote, being your self able to do much more than here is done, and to dispossess as many of the Romish Principles as another, (no Doctor but Practitioner in your art) in this Country, is said to have possessed with them. 'Tis only done, Sir, for a testimony to them, of the zeal I know you possess with for the Protestant Religion, and of the respects which he owes you whom you have made so much,

Your most obliged Servant,

J. C.

A short


A N
ANSVVER

To that Ordinary
Popish Question,

Whether one deserting the *Protestant Religion*, may not be Saved in the Communion of the *Romish Church*?

Matth. 26. 26, 27.

*And said, Take, eat, this is my Body.
And he took the Cup, and gave thanks,
and gave it to them saying, Drink
you all of it.*

N the explication of the Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Supper, from that account which the Evangelist gives of it in this Chapter, (where we have a record of its first Institution); we are come to these words: *And he said, Take, eat, this is my Body.* In my
B last

last discourse I shewed you, what our blessed Lord did; *He took Bread, he blessed it, he brake it, he gave it to them:* In this I shall apply my self to the explication of what he said; He said, *This is my body.* In this the three *Evangelists*, and *St. Paul* all agree; but then *Mark* and *Luke* add, *which was given;* *St. Paul* 1 Cor. 11. saith *which was broken for you.* Then he took the Cup ---and said, *Drink you all of it, for this is my Blood of the new Testament which is shed for the remission of Sins* (so our *Evangelist*); *St. Mark* Ch. 12. 24. saith, He said, *This is my Blood of the new Testament which is shed for many:* *St. Paul* 1 Cor. 11. 25. *This Cup is the New Testament, in my blood, This doe you, as oft as you drink it, in remembrance of me.* All agree in these words, *This is my Body.* For the other Element, *This is my Blood* (saith *Mathew* and *Mark*,) *This Cup is the new Testament in my Blood* (saith *Luke* and *Paul*). The proposition is plain.

Prop. *The Bread and Wine in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, are the body and blood of Christ.*

The difficulty is about the right understanding of the termes, all of them have afforded matter of great Controversy. Both the Subject in the proposition *This*, *et cetera*; and the Predicate, *My body, my blood;* and the coupling particle [*Is.*] A word made up but of two letters, but which hath

hath been occasion of great strife, an entrance into a large Field of *Blood*. The Apostle *Jude* willeth us to contend earnestly for the Faith delivered to the Saints, *Jude* 3. and the Apostle to the *Hebrewes* encouraging them to a patient suffering, tells them, *They had not yet resisted unto Blood*. I know no proposition of Christian Faith, about which there hath been more contention, None, the Errors against the truth in which have been more eagerly resisted unto Blood, for now more then four hundred Years, (since *Pope Innocent* the third's time, for the popish Doctrine in the case commenceth no higher) then this proposition under our present Debate. Upon this *Stone* died all those blessed Martyrs in *Q. Maries* time, in our own Land, yea the whole Christian world hath been upon this account filled with christian Blood. It was then the popish *Shibboleth*, *Doe you believe that in the Sacrament of the Altar is the natural body and blood of Christ which he brought with him out of the Womb of the Virgin?* was the killing-question then: It is made the Protestant *Shibboleth* now; but with this difference (to shew you the difference betwixt the mercies of the Synagogue of Antichrist, & the true Church of Christ): As the *Gileadites* served the *Ephraimites*, *Judg.* 12. 6. whosoever could not speak according to their Dialect, they took him and slew him;

so did the *Papists* to our Fore-fathers: did I say So? yea, they suffered them not to die after the ordinary manner of Malefactors; him or her, after starving and suffocating them in Prison and Coale-houses, they burned alive. But now if any of these nick-named *Chatholicks* cannot speak after Protestants, it is onely said to them, *Sit down lower, and give place to those who are more worthy than you*: We will not trust you with a Sword in your hands, of whose bloody mindes we have had such experience. I shall in my Discourse

1. *Shew you the different Opinions, about the sence of the Proposition, or rather of the word [is] for there lies the difference.*

2. I shall give you some of those Arguments, by which the *Protestant-sense* is confirmed, and the sense by others forced upon it is impugned.

There are three Opinions differently favoured by three great Parties of the Christian World concerning the sence of the VVord.

1. The *Papists* say [It is], that is, the Bread is converted, changed or transubstantiated into the natural body of Christ. Their Opinion is this; That immediately upon the Priests Consecration, the substance of the Bread is turned into the body of Christ.

But the accidents of the bread, the whiteness, quantitie figure, savour, corruptibility,

Transubstantiation.

5

lity, &c. do remain, under which coucheth the real, natural body of Christ, the same which he brought out of the Virgins womb. So that to them [is] signifies *is converted, is changed into*; this is the Romish sense.

2. The *Lutherans* pretend (as justly they may) to abhor this monstrous sense, and mend the matter a little, and but a little; they interpret it by [*adest*] is present with: and this is that which they say, *That the real, natural Body of Christ, is present with the bread & Wine*; the Bread is not annihilated (say they), not changed and transubstantiated; but the body of Christ is *present with it*; and is Sacramentally eaten by the Communicants. Hence (they say), that at the Sacrament of the Supper, there is a *three-fold Eating*.

1. *The one Natural*, so we eat the bread, true substantial Bread.

2. *The second Sacramental*, so we eat the body of Christ: This they say is no *physical eating*, yet performed by our bodily Mouth.

3. *The third Spiritual*, so by Faith every true believer doth there spiritually eat the *Flesh, and drink the Blood of Christ*. Concerning the first and last of these there is no question betwixt us; we grant, the one and the other. The second we do not understand, and shall find it difficult for them so to open it, that we may understand it.

3. The third is the Opinion of more reformed Protestants, who interpret [*Is*] by [*signifies*]; and this is what we assert for the truth of this Proposition,

That the Bread and VVine, in the Sacrament of the Supper, doth truly signify and (by institution) represent the Body and Blood, that is the death of Christ: and Christ (we say) is there, truly and really, yet but Spiritually; and the Vertue and Efficacy of Christs Death, so far as concerns growth and proficency in Grace, is there truly received by every beleiving Soul.

I am not ignorant, that amongst us there are some who halt a little betwixt these two Opinions, they would have a *real Presence* there, and that something more than *spiritual*, but the manner they cannot expresse; but I shall not concern my self in the fancy of so small a party, till they can better open to us their own sense, and distinguish that *Real-Presence more than Spiritual*, from the popish *Transubstantiation* or the Luthereane *Consubstantiation*: what other *concomitancy* then one of these they can fancy, we cannot tell; and believe it will be an hard thing for them to tell us. This is a day when the Popish Emissaries are very busy in every Shop and Coffee-House, I shall therefore insist a little more largely upon this great Controversy: and open my first Proposition by these three:

Transubstantiation.

7

1. Prop. *The Bread and Wine in the Sacrament is not annihilated, not changed, or transubstantiated into the natural body of Christ: (This I assert against the Papists).*

3. Prop. *The natural Body of Christ: is not present in the supper of the Lord with the Elements of Bread and Wine, nor eaten with our Mouths: (this against the Lutherans.)*

3. Prop. *The bread and wine in the Supper of the Lord, do truly signify the Body and Blood of Christ, who is really but spiritually present, and to be by Faith received by believers. I begin, with the first*

Prop. *The bread and wine, in the Sacrament is not the natural body and blood of Christ, by any annihilation, or perishing of the substance of the bread, of wine, or transubstantiation, or change of them into his body and blood.*

I shall not promise you (nor so much as hope my self) to speak any thing new in so beaten a subject, which hath also been argued by so many men of incomparable learning, reason, and understanding in the Scriptures, arguing also for their lives: I may possibly (as the straits of time for this exercise will give me leave) give you something of the substance of larger discourses in a more known Language, and plainer expressions, than those who being out of the Pulpit took themselves obliged to discourse in more Scholastick expressions.

There are but three wayes (which I know of) which God hath given us by which we may measure the truth or falshood of any *Proposition, Revelation, Reason, and Sense*: We will take them all out, and measure this piece of *Popish* stuff by them severally. In short, we charge it with all the faults 'tis possible the matter of a Proposition should be guilty of; as being contrary

1. To the Divine Revelation of Holy *VVrit*,
2. To Reason, in any Exercise of it.
3. To the evidence of all our Senses, under the cognisance of which it can come.

Under one or other of these Heads, I shall reduce all my discourse.

I begin with the first; I know here they will clamour most: they will not pretend to much evidence of *Sense* or *Reason*. All their pretended strength is in *Divine Revelation*; and that no where, but in this and the parallel Texts. Nor have they any thing here, but what is in the *VVord* [is]; nor any more in that, but what is in many other texts to prove *Christ Bread, VVater, a Door, a Shepheard, &c.* (and many other things).

But certainly entire phrases of Scripture, much more single words, confessedly *Polysemous* and of various interpretation, must be so interpreted as to agree with the letter and reason of other Scriptures: Now how much

much other Scripture crosseth this interpretation of this Scripture, I shall shew you by reducing the various scriptures to a few certain Heads.

1. The first rank shall be, all those Scriptures which speak of *Christs body*, not continuing upon the Earth, after his Assention, but the Heavens conteining him. Jo. 13. 33. *Little Children, yet a little while and I am with you, whether I go you cannot come,* Jo. 16. 17. *I go to the Father.* Jo. 12. 8. *The poor you have alwayes with you, but me you have not alwayes.* Acts 3. 21. *VVhom the Heavens must receive until the restitution of all things.* These, and such like Texts, are doubtless to be understood of the bodily presence of Christ; and plainly speak of Heaven, as the place which receiveth it, and must receive it to the end of the world. And those texts in *John* as plainly deny any bodily presence of Christ on the Earth; Now if Christs natural Body, were alwayes present when the Supper is administered, these texts could have no Truth; his Body would at least once a week be upon the Earth, in one place or other: Nay all the week long the papists would have him; if not on the Altar, yet in their *Box*; they must have an *Host* alwayes ready to be carried about, and I hope that too is the natural Body of Christ. But this argument will much depend upon the next.

The

2. The second rank of Scriptures, is of those which deny *the being of Christs Body in more places than one at the same time*. They tell us, that *it is the very same body which Christ brought out of the Womb of the Virgin, which the bread is changed into, or which succeedeth the bread* (for that phrase better sometimes pleaseth Bellarmine) in the Supper of the Lord. Now there is none who knows not that at the same time the supper is celebrated in thousands of places, wherever it is administred (according to their Opinion) must be this body of Christ; but they will not say that Christ hath more than one *natural Body*. And the Scriptures say, that body which he had in the World was not in one place at the same time when it was in another, *Jo. 11. 15. I am glad* (saith Christ speaking of the place where *Lazarus* died) *that I was not there*; What say the Angels? *Mat. 28. 6. He is risen, he is not here*. Why might it not be here, and there, and in a thousand places more, if it be possible that at the same time, it should be where-ever the Sacrament of the Supper is administred? But if it be, it is a body of a different constitution, from that which the Scripture telleth us that was, which Christ brought out of the Virgins Womb.

3. A third rank of Scriptures, shall be of those, *Where our Lord promiseth the presence of his Spirit, to supply his bodily absence*

sence: which is much of the Argument both of the 14th and 16 chapters of *John*, What needed the Apostles have been troubled, for the absence of Christ, as to his natural bodyly Presence, (as it is manifest they were from *Jo. 14. 1. Jo. 16. 7.*)? Or, what needed our Saviour, in order to the comforting of his Disciples under this trouble, have promised the presence of his Holy Spirit for their reliefe under this trouble? If either the Disciples had thought, or Christ had intended, that his natural Body should have been really present with them, so often as they would fulfil his command in eating of this Bread, and drinking this Cup, (which he had commanded them to do often in remembrance of Him). Besides, how came our Saviour in that consolatory Sermon *Jo. 14. 15, 16. ch.* to miss this so obvious and opposite an Argument to comfort them as to their apprehensions of his departure? How easy had it been with him, to have made all short by telling them, you may make Priests, and they may make my Body as oft as they pleasea and you may carry it about with you in Box; and though every Laick shall not see me, but the Priests shall keep me; yet if they be in the least sick, I will presently come unto them; and as I go through your Streets, a Bell shall ring before me, and every one that will may come and behold me,

me. This (I say) had been a real proper Argument; but doubtless neither our Saviour nor his Disciples ever thought of it.

4. A fourth rank of Scriptures, shall be of such as speak of Sacraments as *spiritual Meat*, and the food which Christ giveth as *spiritual Food*, and *eating the Flesh* and drinking the blood of Christ as a *spiritual Action*. 1 Cor. 10. 1. The Fathers did all eate the same *spiritual Meat*; and drank the same *spiritual Drink*: Christ compares himself to *Water*, *Bread*, *Manna*, Jo. 4. Jo. 6. but it is because as these were the *natural Food* of the body, so he was the *spiritual Food* of the Soul; as is plain, for Jo. 4. 14. He is such *Water* as who so *drinkes* shall not *thirst* again, but it should be in him a well of *Water*, springing up to *Eternal Life*, he is such *Bread*, as he that commeth unto him shall never *hunger*, Jo. 6. 35. not die, v. 50. but *live for ever*. It speaketh indeed of *eating the Flesh*, and *drinking the Blood of Christ*; but such an eating, and such a drinking, as they who use not, have no life in them, Jo. 6. 53. they that do use, have *Eternal Life* and shall be raised up at the last Day, v. 54. dwell in Christ and they in Him, v. 56. Now this surely is no natural but *spiritual Eating*. But this Doctrine makes *eating the Flesh*, and *drinking the Blood of Christ*, a *natural eating and drinking*.

drinking; and Christs *Flesh* and *Blood* is by it made natural Food. I am not ignorant that *Bellarmino* contendeth that *Jo. 6.* is to be understood of the Sacrament; but he restrains his assertion to those words in that chapter only, v. 51. *The bread which I shall give is my Flesh which I will give for the life of the World.* But he is aware that divers of his own feather (and those no mean persons) *Gabriel, Cusanus, Cajetan, Tapper, Hesselius* and : *Jansenius*, &c. were of another mind; yet he contends for it, because Christ speaks in the future sense *I will give.* I wonder how Christ could say *I doe give*, when as yet his time of suffering was not come, (of which he manifestly speaks)? but I must not enlarge; those who at their leisure will peruse what *Chamier* and *VWhitaker*, and others have answered, will easily see the vanity of the Jesuites proof of that Text's relation to the Sacrament.

5. A fifth rank of Scriptures, is of those that speak of the *Elements both before, and after the consecration, as Bread and VVine:* And this my text doth, and all the other texts parallel to it, (where the Papists only strength lieth). *He took, He brake, He gave:* What? *Bread*, 1 Cor. 11 23. lest any should say, this was before the Consecration, that is not true; for He did not give it before He blessed it. The Apostle addeth, as oft as you eate this *Bread*, v. 27. Then v. 28. *whose*

whosoever eateth of this Bread. v. 29. Let him eat of this Bread. Then surely when we eat it, it is bread; not the *natural* flesh of Christ, but bread: but I shall have opportunity further to discourse this Argument, when I come to the Arguments from Reason, concluding from Scripture-principles.

6. A sixth rank shall be of those Scriptures, which speak of the action of Christians receiving the Sacrament as a Remembrance of Christ: Surely we do not remember a body present before us, but absent: thus Luke speaketh, *Lu. 22. 19.* thus St. Paul, *1 Cor. 11. 24.* (but possibly I may also hereafter touch upon this).

7. A seventh rank, may be of those Scriptures, which mention the natural body of Christ as subject to our Senses, as exposed to Accidents. These are very many; after His Resurrection (saith Paul) he was seen of five hundred brethren at once, he was felt by Thomas, *1 Cor. 15. Luk. 21.* If the bread be transubstantiated, or His Body coucheth under the accidents of bread, or succeedeth the substance of Bread, it is not certainly such a *natural* body of Christ as the scripture describeth to us; and consequently, not that very body which he brought with Him out of the Virgins Womb.

8. Eightly, we read *Mat. 15. 27.* that

VVha.

Whatsoever entreth in at the mouth goeth into the belly, and is cast out of the Draught. But surely so is not the body of Christ; and it were Blasphemy (in a very high degree) for any to asserit it; nor (to give them their due) will any of them say so; whence we conclude, that then it is bread, not the body of Christ, which we take into our mouth in the Sacrament, and which goeth into our belly: For our Saviour plainly here saith, that *whatsoever goeth into the mouth* [that is, in order to nourishment] *goeth into the belly, and is cast out in the Draught.* We would know of them, what that is, that in the Sacrament goeth into the belly, and is so cast out? They say the substance of the bread is perished; the accidents of bread, cannot disturb the stomach and be so cast out. They say that the *Body of Christ entreth into our mouth*; but the *Species* being corrupted in the stomach, there it ceaseth to be the body of Christ. We ask, what that is that goeth into the draught? It cannot be the meer accidents of bread, *Sola accidentia, nihil patiuntur.* *Bel-larmine* saith, that text is onely to be understood of that which is taken for our bodily nourishment. But this is an exception without warrant from the Scripture; besides, it is apparent, that Physick and other things not taken meerly for bodily nourishment, pass the same way; and in the

Sacrament also it is apparent there is a bodily nourishment; themselves tells us of some that lived meerly with eating and drinking the Sacramental bread and wine.

9. The ninth and last rank of scriptures, which I shall mention, is of those which mention Christ's *state of humiliation* as past. Divines out of scripture take notice of a double estate of Christ; the first they call *his estate of Humiliation*, containing all the time of his suffering, when he was in the form of a servant, when (as the Apostle saith) he *humbled himself; he nothinged himself*: when he was (as the Prophet speaks) *oppressed, afflicted, a man of griefs, &c.* *Is.* 53. The second was his *Estate of Exaltation*, beginning at his Resurrection: Now we say, Christ's *estate of Humiliation* is past: *He was once offered to bear the sin of many, but He shall appear the second time without sin unto Salvation, Heb.* 9. 28. so also *1 Pet.* 3. 18. *Phil.* 2. 8. 9. *He was found in fashion as a Man, and took upon Him the form of a Servant, and was made in the likeness of men, and being found in the fashion of a Man, he humbled himself, and became obedient to Death, even to the Death upon the Cross; wherefore God hath highly Exalted him, &c.* so *Acts,* 5. 31. *Him hath God exalted with his right Hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour.* The scripture every where mentioneth, Christ's

Christ's state of humiliation as past; and his present state to be a state of exaltation, But surely (if this popish Doctrine were true) Christ is in his estate of *humiliation* still. Every time a priest Consecrates he makes his body, and that so handsomely, as that it shall couch under the accidents of Bread and Wine, nay to succeed in the place of a piece of *bakers Bread*; and couch in a box, and be, by the Priest, carried up and down the streets; certainly this is an humiliation, and that to a strang degree.

Thus you have heard, some of that Evidence which we have from the Revelation of Scripture, against this monstrous Doctrine.

2. But we shall find no more light in this Popish *Notion*, by the use of the *Candle of the Lord*, set up in our Souls, (which is reason), then from the *Lamp of the Lords*, (which is holy Writ); it every whit contradicteth Reason as much as Faith. Reason in us is a *power* or *faculty*. Discoursing from Principles to conclusions; and we use it two ways.

1. Setting it to work upon *Natural Principles*, which shine by the light of Nature, and are evident to those who never knew what Scripture meant.

2. Setting it secondly to work upon *Scripture Principles*, and so comparing (as the Apostle saith) *things spiritual with spiritual*.

Few Divine Truths are indeed the first way demonstrable, but some are. Let us in this case use reason which way we will, and we shall find it sufficiently contradicting this monstrous Conception.

Let us use it the first way, observing what we by the light of Nature have discovered.

1. *Concerning Bodies.* 2. *Concerning Substances, and Accidents.* The very light of natural Reason sheweth us, that there are two sorts of Created Beings, which divide the Creation.

Some Beings, have a substance of themselves, as Stones, the Earth, all living Bodies, &c. Others have no substance of themselves, yet are something; as *Colour, Savour, Length, Breadth, &c.* The first we call *substances*, the second we call *Accidents*; because they are appurtenances to substances which are the subjects receiving of them, and without which they cannot subsist; there can be no length, without a substance, which is long.

Looking again we discern a differing Nature in *Substances*: Some have parts disjoined each from other, they have quantity and quality, length, breadth, thickness, colour, visible form, &c. These we call *Bodies*. We discern others which have no such quantity nor quantitative parts; these we call *Spirits*. Our Lord hath taught us this, *Luke 24. 39.* telling us a Spirit *hath no flesh nor bones* as he had. Now

Now concerning these, looking, again, for such properties as should agree to all those substances which we call *bodies*, amongst others we find *Locality*, 1. That every *body* must be in some place, which *limiteth and circumscribeth it*; so that, while it is here, it is not there: Yea indeed this is the property of all created Beings, none of them can be infinite.

2. That all *Bodies* do fill and possess the place where they are, so as no other body can be in that place at that time.

3. That all *bodies* have an extension of parts, and so are demensions, length, breadth, thickness, &c. 4. That all *bodies* fall under our senses: we can see, or feel, or taste, or smell them.

Concerning those Beings in the World, which we call *Accidents*, our Reason informeth us, 1. That they cannot subsist by themselves; but their very Being depends upon their *in being* in some substance; there's no such thing as the height of a Tower: when the tower is down, or whiteness of a Wall when the wall is destroyed.

2. That they are not capable of making addition of substance to our substances; what body can live with smells, or colours, or the length or breadth, or thickness of things.

3. That they are not capable of Corruption and putrifaction; flesh may corrupt, but the colour of flesh cannot putrify: bread

may mould, but the colour, or meer thick-
ness of bread doth not mould. Let us now
apply these principles of Reason to the pre-
sent case: The *Papists* say, That the natural
body of Christ is in the Sacrament, the sub-
stance of the bread is perished, and instead of
it is come the very body of Christ, and this is it
which is put into the mouthes of the Commu-
nicants.

I. A body is limited and circumscribed by
some place: that is, while it is in one place, it
cannot be in another. This was true of
Christ's Body even after his Resurrection,
He is risen (said the Angels), *He is not here*.
So then, if the Body of Christ be natural-
ly and really present here, when the Sacra-
ment is administred, then it cannot be in
any other place at the same time, when
the Sacrament is administred; It cannot be
in Heaven at the same time, &c. If one Bo-
dy could be in ten places, then one body
might be ten bodies (which certainly is a
great contradiction), one and the same body
might be said to be near and a far off, to lie
and to move, &c. *Bellarmino* confesses this
is a most difficult Argument; but yet he
will hold his own, and therefore affirms
that one and the same body may be in di-
verse places: 1. *Because all things are pos-
sible with God.* 2. *Because Christ's Body was*
in Heaven at the same time when St. Paul
was in the Earth Acts 9. Yet even *Bel-*
larmine

larmine himself will acknowledge that God cannot do those things which imply a contradiction: God cannot make a thing to be, and not to be at the same time; and doubtless it is of the Essence of a body (which must have length, and breadth, and thickness) to fill up a place, and it cannot at the same time fill up an hundred places. For that of *Paul*, he doubtless saw the body of *Christ* but not on Earth; but as *Stephen* beheld *Christ* sitting at the right Hand of God; God not working a contradiction, making the same body to be in diverse places, but miraculously capacitating *Paul* to see & hear *Christ* in the Heavens; The Light shined from Heaven, *Act. 9. 3. v. 7.* those that were with *Paul* heard a Voice but saw no man; only *Paul* was miraculously capacitated to see the body of *Christ* as he sat at the right Hand of God. Now if this popish Doctrine were true, one and the same body must be in hundreds of places at the same time.

2. Our Reason tells us, that all bodies must possess, and fill the places where they are, so as no other bodies can be in the same place. All bodies must have some magnitude, and in all magnitude there must be an extention, so as one part must have a situation different from the other the: Arm is not in the place of the finger, but beyond it: *Bellarmino* himself confesseth, that this is essential to a body,

dy, and therefore saith that the whole body, of Christ with its magnitude is in the Eucharist; he saith, that for the limitation of a body by place, or the possession and occupation of a place, these are not essential to quantity, and so are separable from it, because they imply no contradiction. But certainly if it be not essential to a quantitative body to fill a place, then the scite or position of one part should not exclude the scite and position of another; the head might be in the place of the hand, and the hand in the place of the Head; for what hindereth, but the impossibility of two bodies being together in the same place, but that the whole might be in the place of a part? A disposition to a certain place is essential to a body, because of the necessary magnitude of it; and nothing can be imagined more contradictory to the nature of a body then that it should not fill some certain place. I know they urge, *Joh. 20. 19.* That it is said that when the Disciples were met, and the *doors shut*, Christ came and stood in the midst *amongst them*. But to what purpose they urge this, I cannot tell. For it is not said he went through the doors when they were shut; the doors were shut before he came in amongst them, but it is not said they were shut when he came in: The doors might be opened to Him, He might come in through the Window: In short;

short, Christ might come in many wayes without going through the door.

3. Again, our Reason tells us that *all bodies have quantitative parts, and dimensions*; all bodies must have something of greatness, length, breadth, thickness, according to the nature of the body: So that the body of Christ cannot succeed *a wafer-cake*, nor be contained within the space of *a man's mouth*; nor *shut up in a box*, &c. Durandus (one of their School-men) startled at this, and therefore thought it more reasonable to allow God a power to separate quantity from bodies, than to assert a power in God, to make the body of Christ stand in the place of a *wafer*, or lie in a *pix*. Others of them, see absurdity enough in affirming that there may be a body without quantity, (that is, a body, and yet no body); they will say the body of Christ in the Sacrament hath a greatness and quantity, but no *parts* distinct, and separate each from others space; that is it hath quantity, but it no quantitative parts. But Bellarmine is angry with both these Opinionists in his own Religion, and tells us that whole Christ, that is, the whole body of Christ, with its magnitude, and all its accidents (excepting relation to the place which it hath in Heaven; and those things which are consequent to that his existence in Heaven), is in the Eucharist; and the whole body of

Christ with all its accidents (excepting only its relation to the species of bread as is the Eucharist) is at the same time in Heaven: and that his body in the Eucharist hath such figure, colour, and parts, as our bodies have; and this he saith is the common opinion of their Church, *Bellarmino de Euchar. l. 3. cap. 5.* Now let our Reason but judge how this is possible: Suppose our Saviour's body but of the least size of humane bodies, 3. 4. or 5. foot high, and 12. or 16. inches thickness; how is it possible, that it should succeed in the place of a wafer-cake that is not two inches in height or thickness? Is it not another contradiction to say, that a body that takes up the height of 3. 4. or 5. foot, and the thickness of 12. inches, may be contained in the space of one, two, or three inches?

4. Our reason tells us, *That bodies are subject to our senses, to one or another if not to all of them: we may either see or hear, or taste, or smell, or feel any bodily substance; but this cannot be said of the body of Christ in the Eucharist: (but I shall have occasion further to enlarge on this hereafter).*

Let us turn a little and see, what our Reason tells us concerning those beings in the world, which we call accidents: And so I instanced in three things.

1. *That Accidents cannot subsist of themselves.*

selfes. It is impossible to separate the figure of a man from the man, the colour of the *Wall* from the *Wall*, the height, length, or breadth, of an house from the house. But (according to this Doctrine) Accidents may and must subsist without *Substances*; here is the whiteness of the bread, and yet no bread to be white; the taste of bread, the figure of bread, the smell of bread, yet here is no bread to give a tast, nor to have a figure, (than which it is impossible any thing should be more contrary to Reason)

2. Again. Our Reason tells us, that *Accidents* are not capable of any putrifaction; only substances putrify: But according to their Doctrine, either Accidents must corrupt and putrify, or Christ's *Body* must putrify; the latter they will not say, and so are forced to say that *Accidents* may putrify. To avoid this, *Bellarmino* saith, a new matter is Created: But what this new matter is, that must be created and made capable of moulding, stincking, breeding of Worms, &c. they cannot tell us, some say, the Worms are made of the *Air*; but *Aquinas* argues the vanity of this. Some of them say, (and *Innocent* the third is one of them), that the substance of the Bread and Wine, returneth and putrifieth; but *Aquinas* tells them this cannot be, for the same numerical thing once perished, cannot return:

return: and besides, none can tell the time when it returns again to bread. Others say, that there is a new Substance created & that putrifies: *Aquinas* himself thinks there must be some quantity in which the accedents are, and that is it which corrupts. *Cajetan* saith this is impossible, because this abstracted quantity hath no matter in it; he will have therefore this quantity in a moment to be changed into a substance, (contrary to all Reason and Philosophy, which tells us no motion is *in an instant*); that accidents cannot corrupt and putrify, is so evident as nothing can be more; on the other side, it is as evident that the bread and wine in the Sacrament may: They have then nothing to say to avoid this absurdity, but that after the Sacrament, nay in the time while the bread is betwixt our mouth and our stomach, God creates a new bread, which may corrupt in the stomach, or grow mouldy, and breed worms in a box.

3. Our Reason tells us, that accidents cannot add *substance* to *substances*: we are substances, and must be nourished by *substance* saith Reason; The substance of the nourishment passeth into the substance of the body. Surely the colour, figure, length, breadth, &c. of our meat, would not nourish us if separated from the substance of it. It is most certain, the *bread and wine in the Sacrament* will nourish us; themselves tell

us stories of persons maintained by it alone: we would know, what that is which nourisheth us? Not the substance of the bread and wine, that they say is perished; not the body of Christ, then it must corrupt: What then? The accidents sure of the bread which they say do remain: but nothing more contrary to Reason than this. Some of them therefore tell us, that the *substantial forms* of the Bread and Wine remain; and they nourish us: but *Bellarmino* calls them Hereticks that say so. Others make a new Miracle and say, the accidents are turn'd into a substance, and so nourish us. But others tell us plainly, that *Accidents* in great quantity may nourish us. (If I mistake not, *Bellarmino* somewhere saith so). But the *Cardinal* would have been loth to have tried that experiment, whether the meer colour, figure, length, breadth, or thickness, or any other accidents, without the substances of any creatures, could keep one alive.

Thus I have shewed you the *Non-sence* of the Popish figment, as it contradicteth Reason standing upon natural Principles, and from thence making conclusions.

But they will tell us, that every Proposition of truth is not to be brought to the measures of natural Reason: concluding from its own principles: which is indeed true; for we say, that though no proposition

tion of divine Truth be contrary to Reason, yet some are above the comprehension of it, and Reason cannot tell How such things should be. There is therefore another use of Reason, when it discourseth conclusions from Scriptural Principles; we shall find *Reason* in this execution of its office as little a friend to *Transubstantiation*, as we shall see by the following Evidences.

1. I observed to you before, that the Scripture calleth the Sacramental Elements, both before and after Consecration, *Bread* and *Wine*. Now observe the *working of Reason* upon this Foundation in Scripture: we, upon a view of the world, observe a great variety of things, some of the same kind with others, others of a different kind; and accordingly names of things are suted to them: we could otherwise make no distinct discourses, and should as little understand each other as those that builded *Babel*. Now if the names of things generically different one from another, could be indifferently given to each other, we could no longer understand one another; we might call a Horse a Tree, and a Tree an Horse, with as good Reason as *Bread* a body, or a *Body Bread*, unless we speak figuratively in regard of some analogy. 'Tis as good sense to call a stone a man, and a man a stone, as to call bread a living body,

or a living body bread, (in any other than a figurative sense). Now that the Scripture calls the Sacramental Element *bread*, is plain: All the Evangelists and the Apostles saith, He took *bread*, and *blessed it*; it, What? Surely what he took that was bread, He brake it, what was that? Bread still, for it is a relative, He gave it, What did he give? bread still, and said *This is my Body*: *This*, that indeed is a demonstrative particle, but relative too: For our Reason prompts us again to say, *This What?* The *Rapists* are infinitely confounded here; will they say *This* (that is) this which I have taken, blessed, brake, given? Then it must be taken figuratively, for no disparate term can be naturally predicated of another disparate: VVe may as well call Grass an Horse, or an Horse a Tree, as call bread a living body: well, what shall it be then? *This body is my body*. This indeed would make the particle to be of no relative but only of a demonstrative force; But what sense would there be in that? Neither will they have the the *Body of Christ* to be there till the words be pronounced: Others therefore say, *This* doth but denote some uncertain thing to be expounded by something that follows; as we say *This is a Diamond*, &c. Be it so, but still there must be something to which *This* relates; when we say this is a *Sapphire*, or *This is a Diamond*,

we mean *this Being* in such or such: We would know, what being that is that is here called the body of Christ? When we say this is a *Diamond*, we mean this *Stone* or this inanimate Being is a stone called a *Diamond*; but we ask what is the Antecedent to this? It must be this Being, this substance, and in what kind of beings that is? He that saith, *This is a Diamond*, speaks of a species; and the general term, under which that kind falls, is the antecedent and answereth to this: but in this phrase *This is my Body*, either this hath no kind of Being to which it relateth, or else *Bread* is it. To say it hath no Antecedent is to say, *This nothing* is the body of Christ: To say, this (that is) *This bread* is the body of Christ, is to give the same name to things of a quite differing kind; for bread and wine are things *without Life*, and the body of Christ is a *Being with Life*; and it were as good sense to call a *Rock* a *Lion*, or a *Lion* a pebble.

2. But secondly, the Scripture tells us, that our Lord at the same time when he said, *This is my Body*, took the *Cup* also, and said, *This Cup is the new Testament* in my Blood *Lu. 22. 20*. Reason tells us, that if the word [is] must in the first words be taken literally, it should also be taken so in the second phrase: Then the *Cup* (whether made of *Earth*, or *Wood*, or *Silver*, or *Stone*, or any other materials, was the *New Covenant*

in the blood of Christ; but surely the new Covenant in the blood of Christ was not a piece of *Silver*, or *Wood*, or *Stone*. Let them shew us a Reason why it shall not be interpreted alike in both phrases, it being spoken by the *same Mouth* at the *same time*, and concerning the *same thing*? Two things I must confess I have heard offered to blunt the force of this Reason: one thing was once replied to my self urging a Jesuite with this absurdity; he told me *there was not the same Reason* to interpret [is] literally in that phrase, relating to the Cup, as in the other phrase relating to the bread: I demanded, wherein the disparity appeared? He replied, because the latter (interpreted figuratively) is a common way of speaking, but not the other: I confess I understood not the answer. 'Tis true, 'tis an ordinary way of speaking, To say *this Cup* (that is) *This liquor in the Cup*; but that reacheth not the question: for the liquor in the Cup was not the *New Covenant* but *figuratively*; as we say the *Bread is the Body*. Now I do not understand how this is a more ordinary form of speech, to say the *Vine* signifies the Blood of Christ or the New Covenant in his Blood; then to say *The Bread is his Body*. They therefore speak something more plausibly, who, in some pretence of answer to this Argument, tell us that both *St. Matthew*, and *Mark* say, no more

more than *This is my Blood*: and though *St. Luke*, and *St. Paul* say, *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood*; yet they must be interpreted by *Mathew* and *Mark*. This only difficulty attends them, to tell us why *St. Mathew* and *Mark*, (speaking less then the other) must interpret *Luke* and *Paul*, rather than *St. Luke* and *St. Paul*, interpret them? Especially when their additional words are a plain exposition of the other? *This is my Blood* (saith *Mathew* and *Mark*); *This*? this, what? (say we)? Not this *Vine* (say the Papists), but this (we know not what) this *individuum vagum*, this thing to be drunk: but surely *St. Luke* and *St. Paul* are better interpreters. *This Cup* (say they), and surely this is more rational, to admit *Paul* and *Luke*, (both later writers too) interpreters of our Saviour's *VWords*, rather than them.

3. Again, *VWhat* saith the Scripture? *This is my Body, which is broken for you*: There is the Verb [is] in the latter part of the Sentence, shall it be taken, without a figure? Then the *Body of Christ* was broken before *He suffered*; For when our Lord spake this, He had not been broken: The Bread was broken but not his *Body*. They do indeed tell us, *That Verbs in ordinary speech, do not alwayes signify the certain time, but only the truth of the Action*; as

past,

past, or to come, as well as present : and they say true, but then there must be a figure ; they are enforced to allow us an *Enallage*, we contend for a *Metonymy* also. Can they give us any instances where *is*, in the present Tense, doth often denote a time to come ? and have we none to give them where *I am*, and *is*, import no more then signifies ? In what other tense did Christ use it, when he said *I am the Door, the true Vine, I am the way*, &c. But Fourthly,

4. The Scripture plainly mentioneth this Ordinance, as an Ordinance for *Memo-rial*, or to call to Remembrance ; Lu. 22. 19. *Do this in remembrance of me* : so 1 Cor. 11. 24. Now Reason assures us, that they are not things and persons present, about which we use our memories, but persons absent and actions which are past. If the body of Christ be really present as often as the Sacrament is administered, what needed *that Action to call to remembrance* the dying body of Christ ? There were no action proper relating to the body if present, but a contemplation and institution of it ; but this is not the Nature of this Ordinance, as appears from Scripture. VVill any say it is the remembrance of his Death, now his death is not present though his body be present ? VVe answer, His bodily presence would rather hinder the remembrance of his death then promote it. How should the

D taking

taking of his *living body* (as our learned *Whitaker* well argues) commemorate his Death? I know they also tell us, that there is not only a commemoration of his death, but a communication of Christ to Believers: The end of the Sacrament was remission of sins (saith *Bellarmino*). There is no doubt of that, but this is the ultimate end, for the certitude of which, as to us, This Ordinance was instituted, that by remembering Christs death in it we might be ascertained of the remission of Sins; to the obtaining of which Christs bodily presence is not necessary.

5. The holy Scripture assures us, *that the Sacred body of Christ shall not see corruption: Psal. 16. 10. Acts 2. 31. Acts 13. 35.* Nay certainly it forbiddeth us to think or speak unreverently of that holy thing. How then can that be the *Body of Christ*, which the Priest hath Consecrated, and which Communicants take into their mouths, so into the Belly, which corrupteth in the Stomach, is cast out in the draught, which breeds VVorms, mouldeth, and which a mouse may eate, or by a reachy stomack, may be thrown up before it hath had any abode there? *Innocent* (the third Pope of that name) who first opened this pack of ware in the Church of Rome, (immediately after whom *Honorius* came and decreed *Elevation* and kneeling to fit the new made

God

God with a new VVorship), was not so weak as not to foresee these difficulties; it will be pleasant to hear how prettily he answers them in his fourth Book *de mysteriis missæ*. He propounds one question about a *Mouſe* eating some of the consecrated Bread, (which Mr. Gage tells us he saw at a place in the west Indies;) the Question is in that case, *whether the Mouſe eateth the Body of Christ?* if it doth, it certainly seeth Corruption. But the doting Pope will deliver us from this fear; (saith he)

Sicut miraculoſe panis convertitur in corpus Domini, cum incipit eſſe ſub Sacramento, ſic miraculoſe revertitur cum ibi deſinit eſſe.

As the Bread was miraculoſly turn'd into the Lords Body when as the Sacrament begins, So it is Miraculoſly turned again to Bread, when the Sacrament ended. *Aquinas* saith well, the time of this conversion cannot be assign'd; it is (as the Father of this figment saith) as soon as the Sacrament ends: Then the Bread in the *Pix* is bread, & that which they carry about for the host is Bread, and the poor people fall down in the dirt to worship a piece of Bread; for it is now not in *eſſe Sacramenti*, and it is but bread again, *The Nature of the Bread* hath overcome the Miracle (saith *Innocent*,) & *lege detrahit dispensatio*: VVell! but this is a thing which happens but ſeldome. Another question is, *What*

becomes of the body of Christ when it comes out of our mouthes, and down our throats? To this the old man answereth, (cap. 15. ejusdem lib :) *Postquam in percipiendo sensus deficit corpori, non est querenda corporalis sed spiritualis presentia; Christus de ore transit in cor; melius est quod procedat in mentem quam desinat in ventrem, --- stomacho non digeritur, in secessum non effluit.* That is, when the body hath no further sense or feeling of it, we must not seek for a bodily but a spiritual presence; Christ passeth out of the mouth into the Heart, and it is better that he should go into the heart then cease in the Belly; --- He is not digested by the stomach, nor passeth into the draught.

Well! but suppose a stomach disordered by wind, or ill humours, that will not admit it lodging there, but immediately vomits it up? The subtil old Pope thought of this too. (*Ibid. cap. 16.*)

Quum post dispensationis officium aliquid iterato sentitur, in hoc quoque species ad proprietatem sensui famulatur, ut veritas similitudinis ubique servetur; nam in quo similitudo deficeret in eo Sacramentum non esset, sed ibi se proderet & fidelis locum auferet, neque jam crederetur quod ita fieri non oportuit. Itaque quantum ad nos servat per omnia corruptibilis cibi similitudinem, sed quantum ad se, non amittit inviolabilis corporis veritatem.

This (grammatically construed) is thus much ; when after the office of giving [the Eucharist] something is again felt, in this also the *Species* properly serves the sense ; that the truth of the similitude may be every where preserved : For where the similitude should fail, there would be no Sacrament ; but it would there discover it self and take away any room for Faith : Nor would it now have been believed, that it ought not to have so been. Therefore as to us it, in all things, keeps the similitude of corruptible meat, but as to its self it keeps the verity of an incorruptible Body. Let him that reads this understand if he can, what all this signifies as to a solution of the Difficulty, unless he could make us believe that what we vomit up is but the *Accidents of the bread* ; that is the *whiteness*, &c. of it, something like bread, for if it be any substance, we ask, what substance it is ? Not the substance of the bread, that we are told returned into the body of Christ, or at least annihilated, so as the body of Christ succeeded it (to use *Bellarmin's* word :) So that, at best, a new substance must be created, and then it must be created in that instant of time too, while the bread is betwixt the mouth and the stomach : Was ever poor Pope put to harder shifts ? But (the truth is) such mysterys of sense are fitter to be decreed, by one whom the world is before-hand so besot-

ted as to own for infallible, than disputed. But enough of this!

6. The scripture telleth us that the *body of Christ is in Heaven*: where else did Stephen see him? *Acts 7.* the Heavens must receive him (saith the Apostle) *Acts 3. 21.* But we are sure, the *Lords Supper is not in Heaven*; therefore we conclude it is not the body of Christ, in a natural and physical sense: what will they say? doth it come down from Heaven to be eaten so oft as the Sacrament is administred? when then doth it return again? or doth it stay here? it doth not presently I hope returne: what is that in the *pix* then? What's that they carry about in the box with so much solemnity? Here the old Pope was at a loss again; *Ego nescio quomodo Christus accedit, sed & quomodo recediti ignore; novit ille qui nihil ignorat*: I know not (saith he) how he comes, nor how he goes back; he knoweth who knoweth all things. Further yet,

7. It is generally believed, that our Lord himself communicated with his Disciples at his institution of this Sacred Ordinance, and undoubtedly what he eat & drank they did eat and drink: Did the natural body of Christ eat the natural body of Christ think we? That Christ communicated with his Disciples is not indeed in so many words said, but both *Mathew* and *Mark* add those words, *I will not henceforth drink with you of*

Fruit of the Vine; which implies that he had then drank with them of it, and it is generally so received by Divines of all persuasions both ancient and modern: So as if they did eat Christs natural Body, Christ also did eat his own natural body. Nor is the absurdity of this to be avoided, by their saying they deny any *Passion of the body of Christ in this Ordinance*; (with what sense they speak that, meaning impressions of violence by their passions we will examine hereafter possibly): but if there be an agent there must be a patient, and these two cannot be the same. In all actions there must be something to act upon, but if Christ did eat his own body, the *Agent* and the *Patient* were both the same; his natural body was the *Agent* that did eat, and his natural body was the *Patient* too that was Eaten. A man half famished may eat the flesh of his own Arm, a piece of his own body, but that his own body should eat up his own whole body, were very strange.

8. Again, if the natural body of Christ be in the Sacrament, 'tis there either *Capable of suffering*, or not *capable of suffering*: They generally say not *capable of suffering*; but if so, 1. How doth Christ say *It is broken for you*? Doth not breaking think we signify suffering? 2. How is it the same body which Christ brought out of the Virgins Womb? 3. It is certain, that though after

his Resurrection his body was not capable of suffering, yet at the time of his institution of this Ordinance it was so: and if Christ gave his Disciples *his body*, it was such a body as he had to give, and that was a body capable of suffering by violent impressions; and if they did *Eat this*, if this were broken in the Sacrament, then Christ suffered before he suffered. Here again, the first inventor of this (*Innocent the third*) was at a loss; he is forced to grant, that our Saviour gave such a body to his disciples, as he had to give; and that that body was a mortal Body, capable of suffering; well, how then? *Non quod posset pati in Sacramento* (saith he, *l. 4. de missa, cap. 12.*) *sed quod sub Sacramento posset pati; nunc autem sumitur a nobis immortale & impassibile*: Not (saith he) that it could suffer in the Sacrament, but that, under the Sacrament, he might suffer; but now we receive it an immortal body, which cannot suffer. (How much sense there is in this judg you.) VVell, but if Christ in the first institution gave his Disciples a body capable of suffering by violent impressions, how came it that the Disciples, eating it, did not fasten their Teeth in it? Hear the old Pope again, how wittily he untie this Knor,

Quod autem passibilis Edebatur non ladebatur, non erat humana natura sed divina potentia quæ valebat quicquid omnino volebat.

Wit, in the two *Paranomasiae's*, in it, than any good Sense or Divinity). It is Divine Power it seemes that alone could secure it from suffering, for of it self it was capable; if they could but prove too that Divine Power doth all it can do, and useth to exercise it self in things of no significancy or utility, their work was done, as to this business; but either of these will be difficult.

9. Further yet, if what we receive in the Sacrament, be the *Natural Body of Christ*, then the meat is *fleshly Meat*; or else we eat the natural Flesh, and yet do not eat the *natural Flesh* of Christ (which is a contradiction). But the Scripture speaks of *Sacramental Food* as *spiritual Meat* and *spiritual Drink* and of the Food, which Christ gives, as spiritual Food; The Fathers under the old Testament (saith the Apostle 1 Cor.

10. 11.) did eat *the same spiritual Meat* and drink *the same spiritual Drink with us*. And this (saith he) was *Christ*; but it could not be the natural Body of Christ, for he was not then incarnate, he had not yet assumed a natural Body. Christ tells us also that the meat, he gives, is spiritual, not carnal; Jo. 6. (But I have enlarged upon this under the first head of Arguments).

10. Our Lord speaking Jo. 6. of that *Bread* which he giveth to his people to Eat, saith, that *He who eateth thereof shall not Die*, v 5. This *Bread* (he saith) is his *Flesh*;

v. 51. & who so eateth his Flesh, & drinketh his Blood, hath eternal life, ver. 54. And he will raise him up at the last day; and he that eateth the Flesh, and drinketh the Blood of Christ, dwelleth in Christ, and Christ dwelleth in him: So that whosoever eateth the Sacrament, if Christ there gives his flesh, he dwelleth in Christ, and Christ dwelleth in him; he hath eternal life, he shall never dye, but shall be raised up at the last day. But can any one think that these things are true of every one that receiveth the Sacrament? How then can any eat and drink unworthily? or eat and drink Judgment to themselves (as the Apostle plainly saith, 1 Cor. 11.) To avoid this, the old Pope (before mentioned) telleth us of a twofold Body of Christ in the Sacrament: "*A true Body*" "*and a mystical body: A true body, the same*" "*which he brought out of the Womb of the*" "*Virgin; the mystical body, which is (he*" "*saith) his Church, quickned by his Spirit;*" "*Christ saith of his true body, This is my Bo-*" "*dy which is broken for you; of his mystical*" "*body the Apostle saith, We that are many,*" "*are one Bread, and one Body: Christ's true*" "*Body is eaten (he saith) Sacramentally un-*" "*der the species; The mystical body is eaten*" "*Spiritually by Faith. He saith, both good*" "*and bad men eat the true Body, but only*" "*good men eat it to their Salvation, bad men*" "*eat it to Destruction; (1. præd. cap. 14.)*"

Thus

Thus far he. But can any one understand this? The mystical body he saith is the Church, and proves it well from 1 Cor. 10. But how is this mystical Body eaten Spiritually? doth the Church eat the Church? They are both his own phrases, *Mysticum quod est Ecclesia*, & - *Mysticum comeditur Spiritualiter, id est in fide*? In short, there can be no eating Damnation or Judgment in the Sacrament, if that which we eat be what he promised, Jo. 6 (as the Papists contend it is.)

II. Further, let us but observe what the Scripture telleth us of that Body which Christ brought with him into the World: We shall find the Scripture describing it as a true humane real body, 1. *Made of the Flesh of the Virgin*; that which is *born in thee*, saith the Angel; or if that place did not prove it (I know some Ancient Hereticks quarrelled at the form of the expression), yet 1 Rom. 3. is plain enough, *He was born of the Seed of David, according to the Flesh*. It had *Flesh, and Blood, and Bones*; you see me have so (saith Christ,) it was limited by place, it was *here*, not *there*; it had *dimensions*, it was subject to *Accidents, Hunger, Thirst, Pain*: Thus the Scripture describes to us the Natural Body of Christ. Now (say the Papists) there is in the Sacrament the Natural Body of Christ, the same body which he brought with

with him out of the Virgins Womb, but not subject to sufferings; that is not all, for, after his Resurrection, his Natural Body was indeed incapable of violent impressions, but we have a *Body* here (if we will believe them) which is not of the Seed of *David*, but either *Created* or made of Bread; which at the same time can be *here* and there, and in a thousand places, and fill no place, but lie *incognito*, under the accidents of Bread; a Body without dimensions, without visible figure or stature; an humane Body which can be in the place, that, but now, a wafer only fitted, that can be shut up in a box, and carryed about by a *Mas-Priest*; was this (think we) such a Body as the Scriptures describe the Body of Christ brought out of the Womb of the Virgin to have been? or was that Body (as the *Marcionites* and some other ancient Hereticks affirmed) no *true* Body? but something which look'd like a Body, and indeed was not so? I cannot possibly understand how their usual refuge of the *Divine Omnipotency* can help them here: Omnipotency it self (as they confess) cannot work a contradiction, but what is this less? To make that to be a Body which remaineth not a Body, even while it is a Body? It is (they say) that Body of Christ which he brought with him out of the Virgins Womb; yet plainly you see it is not that Body which Christ brought out
from

from the Virgins Womb, nor any thing like unto it.

12. Further yet; If this *Doctrin* be true, then the Body, which Christ brought out of the Womb of the Virgin, is proper nourishment for our bodys. The strength of this Argument lyeth here; it is certain we eat and drink, in the Supper of the Lord, something which turns in *succum & sanguinem*, into proper nourishment for our Bodys: For it is demonstrable, that a Man or Woman may be nourished, and live of only *Bread and Wine* Consecrated for this administration: Now either the *Body of Christ* is that which nourisheth in this case, or else 'tis something else: If they say it is something else, we desire to know what it is; for they all agree that the substance of the Bread is perished. 'Tis turned (saith *Innocent*) into the Body of Christ; the Body of Christ succeeding the place of it (saith *Bellarmino*): So that one way or other that is gone, and nothing of the substance of that is left to nourish us. What is it? if the *Flesh and Blood*, be the Body of Christ, then the *Flesh and Blood* of Christ is proper nourishment for our Bodys, and consequently must be chewed, drank, concocted, digested, &c. But this they will not allow. Well! what is it then? Some tell us, that *something is bred of the adjacent aire, and that is it which nourisheth us*: But that (saith *Aquinas*, 3.

p. 9. 77. art. 5.) appeareth divers ways impossible; because there appeareth no change in the aire, neither is the nature of the aire such, as to afford matter proportionate. Others say, That when the *Body of Christ* is out of our mouths, the substance of Bread returneth again; (this was Pope Innocents sense): *Quod a grandi miraculo incepit, in grandi miraculo desinit* (saith he); but this is impossible (saith *Aquinas*), for the substance of the Bread and Wine being turned into the Body of Christ (he scruples not the word turned), it cannot return without the turning of the Body of Christ back again into Bread and Wine (which is impossible); and if the Body of Christ should be there, and that under the accidents of the Bread and Wine, and yet the Bread and Wine return, it must be without its accidents (which is all impossible); some may say, new Bread and new Wine is created, but this is not reasonable (saith *Aquinas*) to affirm any miracle but what floweth from the consecration. Some say, the substantial formes of the Bread and Wine remain, and they nourish, but (saith *Aquinas* right qu. 75.) this is impossible, that the substance should perish, and the substantial forms still remain. It must therefore follow, that the nourishment we have, I mean the bodily nourishment which one hath, or may have from the Sacrament, is either

either from the *accidents of the Bread and Wine* (which indeed the wisest of them say), but is impossible; or from the *Flesh and Blood of Christ* (if this Doctrine were true); so Christs Flesh and Blood should be natural nourishment for our bodys, for the accidents of the Bread, as the colour, the figure, the meer length, breadth, &c. are such things as experience tell us will not nourish our Bodys.

13. Add yet further. *If the Bread and Wine in this Ordinance be turned into the Body of Christ, then is Christs Body in part made up of Bread, (baken Bread,) and bread is taken into the Communion of the humane Nature of Christ; and consequentially into the fellowship of the second Person in the Trinity.* I know this reflexion troubles them, for then it is impossible it should be the same Body which he brought out of the Womb of the Virgin: But let us hear how they can quit themselves of this consequence; was that Wafer which the Priest had in his hands ever Bread or no? Was it not Bread in the Bakers hands? Was it not Bread in the Priests hands, until he had pronounced the last words of Consecration? They will answer, yes: What is now become of the nature and substance of this Bread? Is it annihilated, and the Body of Christ substituted in the stead of it? No (saith *Aquinas*, p. 9. 75. art. 3, 4.) for the Body of Christ

Christ comes not here by any local motion, but by conversion of the Bread into his Body, which could not be if the *Bread were annihilated*: And besides, then there must be a new Creation of Bread betwixt the Communicants mouth and stomach, or else what should corrupt in the stomach? what should nourish the body? Besides, if the *Bread* be made nothing, how do their Priests *conficere corpus*, make the Body of Christ, which *Gardiner* saith the Father held? He must then *Create* the Body of Christ, and then the Creature must turn Creator. Is it not annihilated, but only transubstantiated? Still either the *Bread* and the Body of Christ, after the Consecration, are *one thing*, or two substances. Are they two things? how is it then said *This is my Body*? not *Here is my Bread*, and *here is my Body*: Are they but one substance, and yet the substance of the Bread not annihilated, the matter not destroyed but only turned? How is this possible without *impanation*? Either the Bread is made the Body, as the Water was made Wine *Joh. 2.* or the Body is made Bread. The Bakers bread is taken into the Communion and fellowship of the humane Nature of Christ; *Innocent* speaks this out, (*l. 4. myst. missæ. cap. 19.*) *Sicut dicitur Christus manducari quia corpus ejus comeditur, ita credendus est in ipsum mutari quoniam*

corpus eius convertitur.

This is plain Enough. Nor doth *Aquinas* at all mind it; (I know *Bellarmino* is sometimes shy of it, and useth the Term *successus*, but let him then answer his Brethren) *Innocent* saith, *As whole Christ is said to be Eaten, because his Body is eaten; so Bread is said to be turned into him, because it is turned into his Body.* He doth indeed endeavour to avoid the latter inconvenience of Bread being taken into the fellowship of the Divine Nature, (which yet he doth not effect, for there is no eating of the Body of Christ but by Faith, which indeed respects the whole Person of Christ, not a single Nature,) but you see he maketh no difficulty of saying that Bread is turned into the Humane Nature of Christ: And how this can be without *Impanation* (that is) taking Bread into the fellowship of Christs humane Nature, will certainly pose any wise man to phancy. The aforesaid Author, therefore, in the same place doth well to fall off from this inquiry, by telling us, that the Sacraments are to be adored not examined: But (by his leave) we must know what we Worship, and not (like the Samaritans) adore we know not what. But let us go on.

4. The Scripture telleth us, that *Christ* took Bread and brake it, and said *this is my Body.* This was either all in reality, and to be

E

be

be taken *literally*; or all in a figure. He really took bread, and brake Bread, (that is certain); he saith *This is my Body* which is broken. The Bread (say we) signified the Body of Christ, the breaking of the bread signified the suffering of his Body: No say they, the bread is really the Body of Christ: Then say we, the breaking of the Bread is really the breaking of the Body of Christ; then so often as this Sacrament is Administred, Christ really suffereth; for in this Text, *As the Body is to the bread so is the breaking to the Suffering*: Then must Christ (who the Apostle saith died but once) really die so often as this Ordinance is administred. This they must grant, or give us some good convincing Reason, why one term in the same sentence should be taken *literally*, and the other relating to *figuratively*.

15. Further yet, by this most absurd interpretation all the *Sacramental Analogy* and *proportional Similitude* is taken away. There is a double *Analogy* very remarkable which the Scripture mentioneth in this Ordinance.

1. The first is between the *Vertue*, which Bread and Wine hath in order to the nourishment of the Body; and which the *Meritorious Sufferings* of the Body of Christ have in order to the nourishment of the Soul to Life Eternal. As bread in this Ordinance takes

with the Mouth, swallowed, and digested in the Stomach, doth nourish the body of Man, to the upholding and conservation of his natural Life; so Christ's meritorious Death (who being the Eternal Son of God suffered Death in our assumed flesh) apprehended by faith, in this Sacramental Exhibition nourisheth the Soul unto Eternal Life. Now according to this Interpretation, here is no bread left; the substance of the bread is annihilated (say some of them), converted say others into the Flesh and Blood of Christ; either way this Analogy is destroyed.

2. Again, the Apostle determineth an Analogy betwixt the Bread and the Mystical Body of Christ (which is the Church) 1 Cor. 10. 17. We being many are one Bread and one body, for we are partakers of that one Bread. Divines make the Analogy thus, As many grains of Corn are united in one Loaf or peice of bread, so believers which are many, make one Church meeting together in the Communion of that Ordinance; but by the Popish sense, this analogy is wholly destroyed, here is no bread for many grains of Corn to be united in.

16. Add yet further, The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is an Ordinance instituted for this end, to signifie, seal, and perfect the Union which is betwixt Christ and e-

every truly believing Soul; therefore surely the Union betwixt Christ, and the bread and wine in this Ordinance is not a nearer and stricter Union, than that between Christ and the Soul; But in the Union which is between the believing Soul and Christ, neither the Soul nor Christ are transubstantiated. Christ is not turned into the substance of the Soul, nor is the Soul turned into the Substance of Christ; nor is the Soul annihilated, and Christ succeeding instead of it. We abhor those Blasphemous Terms of being Christed and Godded, or that Christ abideth under the accidents of our Nature; yet this is that which they say concerning the Union of the Body of Christ with the Bread. Yea certainly, they make the Union of Christ with the Bread stricter then the Union of the two Natures in the Person of Christ; for though we say the Divine Nature taketh to it the humane Nature, yet, neither is the Humane Nature turned into the Divine Nature, nor the Divine Nature turned into the Humane Nature; there is no confusion of Substances, no couching of one Nature under the species of the other, the Substance being destroyed, no succeeding of one into the place of the other.

17. Further yet, the Sacrament is a Sign relating not only to the Natural but to the mystical body of Christ, as I before shew-

ed and is confirmed from 1 Cor. 10. 16, 17. why should we not therefore as well say, *This is the Mystical Body of Christ*, as *This is the Natural Body*, and so the Bread shall either be turned in to the Church: or the whole Church shall couch under the Species of the bread; then which surely nothing could be spoken more absurdly, yet with as good Reason as they speak, and if Divine Power can effect the one it can also effect the other.

18. Add to these, In every Sacrament there must be Matter and Form, *Verbum & elementum, signum & signatum*. The Elements surely are the Matter of the Sacrament; if they be annihilated, or converted, the matter of the Sacrament is destroyed: there remaineth nothing but the body of Christ which is the thing signified, and so the Sacrament is destroyed and becomes *no Sacrament*, it wanting one essential part. *Belarmine* cap. 23. grants that the matter of which the Sacrament is made, is *bread*; which he saith remaineth so far as it is needfull for it as a Sacrament, that is a sensible Sign, (that is) the Accidents remain. But surely it was not the appearance of bread, or the accidents of bread, which are the matter of a Sacrament, these are not *panis* *veritatis* (as he saith the matter of the Sacrament is) he saith, the Substance of bread belongs not at all to the Reason of the Sa-

crament, but only the external Accidents of it: But certainly that which Christ had in his hand when he said *This is my Body*, belonged to the Reason of the Sacrament; and that was substantial Bread, not the meer accidents of Bread.

19. Further yet; *Christ never instituted that which really could not profit his people: But this carnal eating the Flesh, and drinking of the Blood of Christ could not profit.* Themselves cannot give an instance of any advantage from the carnal Eating, but what is the true effect of the inner Spiritual Eating the Flesh and drinking the blood of Christ by Faith. But what need we any further witness? Christ himself telleth us *Jo. 6. 63.* *It is the Spirit that quickneth, the Flesh profiteth nothing;* (that is) *the eating of his Flesh,* for all along the Chapter he is speaking of eating his Flesh. I know the *Papists* have many Cavils to that Text; some say he speaks of the *Capernaïtes* Flesh, not of his own; some of a carnal man, &c. But the Text is clear enough to a Reader but of an indifferent judgment, that Christ, by those words, doth disprove that gross and carnal Sense which the *Capernaïtes* had, of eating the Flesh and drinking the Blood of Christ and sheweth them, that (if that could be) it would do none any good.

20. I might lastly add (which our *Papists* do much insist on), that Christ never

instituted any thing *Impious and unnatural*: He never designed to make believers *Cannibals* or eaters of *Mans Flesh*. But I have insisted long enough upon this head of Arguments, and this particular Argument is spoken largely to by a worthy Author in our own Language. I come in the last place to shew the contradiction of this proposition to Sence.

3. *Aquinas* saith right of this New Article of their Creed, *Neque sensu neque intellectu deprehendi potest*, (3. p. 9. 75. art. 1.) It can neither be Comprehended by our understanding, nor by our senses: But he should have done well, to have confirmed to us, that the matter of any Article of our Faith, is contrary to our Reason, and all Evidence of all the Senses of all men in the World, (which is the present cause). Propositions of Divine Truth, as to the matter of them, are of various Natures: Some are onely evident upon Divine Revelation, and are purely matters of Faith; Such is the Doctrine of the Trinity of Persons; That of the Personal Union of the two Natures in Christ, &c. They fall not under our senses, and our Reason saith, *How can these things be?* They are above it's reach. But the Word revealeth them in several Texts, and revealeth nothing contrary to them, and therefore we believe them. Others are not onely clear by plain Scripture, bur easily concluded

cluded by reason, discoursing conclusions either from Natural, or Scriptural Principles: Others fall under the cognisance of Sense; *That men must Dye, &c.* But Here is a Proposition pretending to no Revelation, (but in this text) contrary to multitudes of other Scriptures, which reason concludes against, both from Natural principles, and Scriptural foundations; and is so far from being evidenced by Sense, that there is nothing which our senses more contradict. This last I shall a little open to you in two particulars.

1. *The same Bread is the object of our Senses, both before and after the Consecration.*

2. *No Body is the object of our Senses after the Consecration.*

1. I say first, *The same Bread is the object of our Senses, both before and after the Consecration*: before the Consecration we saw it *Bread*, we felt it *Bread*, it had the smell, the tast of bread, and after the Consecration, we see, we feel; we smell, we tast it so still: and these are all the Senses we have by which it is possible we should take cognisance of it.

2. *The body of Christ is not the Object of any of our Senses after the Consecration.* Doth any one see it, or feel it, or smell it, or tast it? What need we any further Testimony? Surely the Evidence of our Senses

in things that fall under the cognisance of them (as all natural bodies do), is the most certain Evidence we can have. The strength of this Argument dependeth upon the Truth of that *Maxime* in Philosophy, *That the Senses are not deceived about their proper Objects.* There have indeed been great disputes about it among Philosophers heretofore; some maintaining that they could never err; Others, that there is no certainty in them: But the generality of modern Philosophers maintain, a middle Opinion betwixt these two Extremes;

That the judgment of sense is true or false, according to the Object, the disposition of the Instrument, and of the mean, and the intention of the Mind.

1. As to the *Object* or thing perceived, they say there must be a due distance betwixt the Sense and it; we see the Sun, Moon, and Stars, much less then they are. What is the Reason? The distance which is betwixt our Eye and those celestial Bodies. 2. *The Object must be of a due quantity*; some things are so small that though they be nigh enough to us we cannot truly discern them. 3. It must have a just position. 4. It must be for some time before our Sense or under it; a transient glance of the Eye may mistake its Object. 5. *It must not be of that Nature as to offend our Sense*; for then it hindereth its due operation: The great light of the Sun blinds

blinds us and confounds our Sight.

2. *Our Organ and Instrument of Sense also must be in tune:* He who is sick and hath his Palate vitiated with Humours, doth not tast things as they are; nor the diseased Eye see things as they are, &c.

3. *The Medium by or through which we see must be rightly disposed and proper:* We have not a true sight of the Sun in misty weather, because the Air (which is our *Medium*) is troubled, nor of a staff in the water, because the water is not the proper *Medium* of sight. 4. *Lastly our mind must be intent upon the thing.* It is the Soul which seeth by the Eye, tasteth by the Palate, &c. Now if our mind be intent upon some thing else, though our Eye be open, we do not rightly discern the colour; and though the meat or drink be in our mouth, we may not truly discern the tast.

Philosophers say, that (except in these cases) our Senses cannot deceive us. But in our case it cannot be denied, but the Object (a natural body) is proper, as to the distance, it is near enough; as to the quantity, it is big enough; the position of the Object is right; it is some time before our Senses, and comes very often under them. Communicants have not all vitiated Eyes, or Palates, so there is no fault in the Organ; The *medium* is true and proper, we have the Air to see it in, and it is not al-

always misty weather; Our minds are intent, and the more because our Adversaries are so confident that the natural Body of Christ is there; that they dare torture and burn hundreds of the Servants of God because they will not say so too. Now in this case if our senses can deceive us, What judgment can we make of any thing in the World? What saith *Bellarmino* to this?

He saith, our Senses are deceived in judging of the greatness of the Stars of the figure of a staff in the water (which there may seem to us crooked when as yet it is streight): but how idle is this? When we see the Stars at an undue distance, and the staff by an undue *Medium* can any such thing be said in our case? He tells us a pair of green Spectacles will make a thing look green that is not so; but is not here an undue *Medium*? That a vitiated Palat will make sweet things tast bitter; but what is this to the purpose? Is every one sick which receives the Sacrament, so as he cannot tast bread from Flesh. He tells us, that In the Rain-bow we think we see divers Colours, when 'tis nothing but light reflected on a Cloud; but is that a due distance think we? In short all that he saith with pretence of contradiction to this Argument from Sense (built upon that *Maxime* in philosophy) is this,

That the Senses cannot be deceived as to accidents

cidents which are the senses proper Objects, but about the substances they may.

Here he saith, the Sense is not deceived about the Accidents of bread, for they are so, they are there; but it is deceived as to the substance, which is but the Object of the senses by accident; to this purpose he tells us a story of a piece of Wood, brought in his time out of Syria to Room; which many took for Wood, the Figure, the Colour, spake it so: Thus he saith we may take Copper to be Gold, and a piece of Ice to be Chrystal; and this he thinks fully enough to answer the Argument. But how little it is to that purpose, you will easily judge by considering with me these following particulars.

1. That *what he saith is false*; if it be not understood with the aforementioned limitations; for in all those cases 'tis manifest, the Senses may be deceived about accidents.

2. But Secondly, it is enough for us that he saith *The Senses cannot be deceived about Accidents [their proper Objects]*; for if the Body of Christ be there, it hath certainly its accidents with it. *Durandus* indeed tells us it is there without quantity; but *Bellarmino* saith it is there with its whole quantity, form, figure, &c. Now we can see none of these, therefore either the Senses may be deceived about their proper Objects, or Christs Body

dy is not there (according to *Bellarmino's* own confession).

3. But whether meer Accidents be the only proper Objects of all our Senses, and not substances, deserves a little Examination. I know it is commonly said that *Substantia non incurrit in sensum*; but what shall we say for our feeling? do we onely feel the Accident primarily? We feel the bread betwixt the Teeth; we feel no Flesh: again, the *qualitas tactilis*, the touchable condition or quality of the thing is the accident, and differs plainly in *flesh* and *bread*; now we feel no flesh, and therefore certainly there is none there.

4. Again, Suppose that our Sense may be deceived; without the help of another, yet under the Testimony of three or four of these Witnesses, shall not a Truth be Established to us? We See, we Feel, we Smell, we Taste it Bread; We See no Body of Christ, we Feel none, we Smell, we Taste nothing like a Body: If the Eye may take Vinegar for Wine, the taste will correct it; Or if it takes Ice for Christal, or Wood for Stone, the Touch or Feeling will rectify it; but here all the Senses conspire and tell us 'tis Bread, nothing but Bread, it is no Body; May they all be deceived?

5. But suppose all our Senses, passing a Judgment upon a thing under their cognisance might be deceived for once, yet will they
be.

be deceived an 100 times about the same thing. Let us come to this ordinance not once or twice but an Hundred times, we shall still See, Tast, Smell, Feel it Bread, and no Body. If Here be any Deception of the Senses, the four of them together are mistaken, and that not once but an 100 times in the same thing.

6. And suppose the Senses of some Person might deceive them as long as they live about a particular object, yet would all men's Senses, or any great Member of men's Senses deceive them at all times about the same object? How many Hundred Thousand Protestants are there? Yet if one of them in this point be in his Senses here deceived, all are: Yea, I believe Papists too; there are very few Instances in the World of any of them, who will pretend to See, Feel, Tast, or Smell a Body. And as few who will not say, that which they see looks like Bread, feels like Bread, &c. How then do they know it is not so? No other way but by Faith (they say). Christ hath said *This is my Body*: Well, but Christ also said *This Cup is the New Testament*; was then the Earthen, or Silver Cup, the New Covenant? No; but the Church tells them, *This is my Body*, must be taken Literally; but *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood* is there, must be taken Figuratively: *Venales animas! Servitutem paratas.*

7. But yet they might have pretended something, if Christ had not referred the judge

ment of the reality of his Body after his resurrection to the Judgment of humane Senses. Luk. 24. 39. When they judged him a Spirit, how doth he rectify their mistake? Doth he tell them he was a true body, though invisible, and not to be felt? No such matter. Nabash the Ammonite may put such a Terme of reconciliation with Israelites, as to pull out their right Eyes; but saith Christ, Behold my hands and feet, it is I my self, handle me, and see me, for a Spirit hath neither flesh nor bones as you see me have. These men say It is he, it is Christs true Body, but we can neither see hands, nor see, flesh nor bones; We cannot handle him.

8. How ridiculously do they talk of a Miracle in the case? Yea, many miracles which their Mass-Priests work in the case, to say nothing else in the case, can they shew us in the Scripture an example of any such miracle, where the Senses, none of the Senses, no not four of them working together, Where the senses of Thousands, working not transiently, but in many repeated Acts, cannot discern any such thing? Certainly this is no Miracle, but one of Antichrist's Lying Wonders; Which none can be such a Sot as to believe, whom God hath not given over either to a reprobate Sense, or to strong Delusions to believe a Lye, because he hath not received the Truth in the Love thereof. Let us I pray take a view of some Transubstantiating Miracles, which we have in sacred

sacred Record, and see how they agree with
 this pretended Miracle: *Lots Wife was turn-*
ed into a pillar of Salt; but after this was
 done, did any see *Lots Wife yet a live,* or
 Feel her *Natural Flesh, and Bones?* Or did
 they not See or Feel the *Pillar of Salt,* but on-
 ly believe it while they saw *Lots Wife yet a*
live? Christ Joh. 2. *Turned Water into Wine;*
 But what think you when Christ had done
 this, did it still, Look, and *Tast,* and *Feel*
like Water? Was there in it no colour, tast,
 nor smell of Wine? Surely then the Ma-
 ster of the Feast wofully flattered the Bride-
 groom, telling him he had kept the best
 Wine till the Last, if at the last he could nei-
 ther *Tast, See,* nor *Smell* Wine there. In all his
 other Miracles, did not the senses judge? Did
 not men see the *Dead raised,* the *Lepers clean-*
sed? Surely this is an horrid contradiction,
 to annihilate our Substance and to create a-
 nother to lie hid under the accidents of it; or
 to turn one Substance into another, when ma-
 nifestly, in the judgment of all the senses por-
 ing upon the pretendly converted Substance,
 it is yet the same, and there is no such other
 substance as it is pretended to be converted
 to. I know *Bellarmino* saith, the Bread is not
annihilated, because (he saith) it is not made
nothing; but turned to a Body: but he
 triflcth, for as Bread it is *annihilated* surely.
 It is made nothing of Bread; It is turned in-
 to the Body of Christ, the substance of
 bread,

bread, is annihilated; but yet we see, we taste, we Smell Bread: Is it turned into a body? we See, we Feel, we Taste no body; are not these strange Miracles?

9. Lastly (to put an end to this Discourse), *what certainty doe these men leave us of the Truth of any thing under Heaven?* If we must not trust our Senses, how shall we know there are any such words in Scripture as *This is my Body*? It may for ought we know be, *This is the sign of my Body*. So that certainly we have better proof, that the Natural Body of Christ is not in the Sacrament, and the bread is not turned into it: For if the judgment of our Senses be true, it is not the Body of Christ, it is bread; If that be not true they may read the Scriptures false; they cannot be certain there is any Scripture speaks so.

But I have spoken enough to shew the monstrous Folly, and Vanity, and Blasphemy of this Interpretation.

Use. 1. In the first place, Let us hence conclude what *horrible Guilt, of the most gross and damnable Idolatry, 2. Horrid and most hideous Blasphemy, 3. Innocent blood and detestable Cruelty; cleaveth to the Church of Rome*: And from thence gather an answer to that now ordinary Question, *Whether a person turning from the Protestant Church, to the Communion of that Church, may or may not persist, or dying in that Communion be*

saved? There are divers most detestable Doctrines (as that of the Lawfulness of murdering Princes by any private Hand, if once the Pope hath Excommunicated them, &c.) Which when we charge them with, they think they quit themselves of by telling us, they are not the Doctrines of their Church, but the sentiment of some particular Doctors; they were never confirmed by the Pope & a general Council. But they cannot say so for this; In the Council of Trent they established these Canons amongst others about it: Sess. 13.

Can. 1.

If any deny that the Body, and Blood, and Soul; and Divine Nature of Christ, (and so whole Christ;) is not truly, really, and substantially contained in the Sacrament of the most Holy Eucharist, but shall say that he is only there, as in the signe, or figure, or Virtually; Let him be accursed.

Can. 2.

If any shall say, that in the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, the substance of the Bread and Wine remaineth, together with the Body and Blood of Christ, and shall deny the wonderful and singular Conversion of the whole Substance of the Bread into the Body, and of the whole Substance of the Wine into the blood of Christ, the species onely of Bread and Wine remaining. --- Let him be accursed.

Can.

Can. 4.
If any shall deny, that when the Consecration is finished, the Body and Bloud of Christ is not in the admirable Sacrament of the Eucharist, but only in use, while it is taken and not before nor after, and not in the Host or Particles, which remain after the Communion, Let him be Accursed.

Can. 6.
If any one shall say, that Christ the only begotten Son of God, is not to be Worshipped with an external Divine worship in the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, and therefore it is not to be Venerated by a peculiar festival Celebration, nor to be solemnly carried about, and publickly held out to the People to be Adored, according to the universal Right and Custome of Holy Church, and that the adorers of it are Idolaters; Let him be Accursed.

Can. 8.

If any one shall say that Christ held forth in the Eucharist, is to be Eaten only spiritually and not Sacramentally and really, Let him be accursed.

Here are five Curses concern us; but they are but the Popes and the Trent Counsellors, but the Apostle (whose words have far more weight) hath twice cursed them all; Gal. 1. 8, 9.

F. A. V.

Though

Though we, or an Angel from Heaven,
 preach any other Gospel unto you, than
 that which we have Preached to you,
 Let him be Accursed.

As we said before, so say I now again, if
 any man Preach any other Gospel unto
 you, then that which you have received,
 Let him be Accursed.

Let us be more afraid of the Apostles,
 than of the Popes *Anathemas*. You see
 this is the Doctrine of their Church, That
 the Bread and Wine is really turned into the
 Body and Blood of Christ, That Divine
 Worship is to be given to it, and that not only
 in the Sacrament, but when it is carried a-
 bout in Procession.

Now if (as I have abundantly proved to
 you) this be but a Dream, and it be Bread
 still which they thus Worship, What grosser
 Idolatry was ever committed under Hea-
 ven? Indeed * themselves confess it.

None can doubt (saith
 their great Master Mar-
 tyr Fisher, some times
 Bishop of Rochester), "but
 * *Roffensis Con-* "if there be nothing but
tra. Decol. l. 1. Bishop of Rochester), "but
cap. 2. See also "if there be nothing but
Costerus En- "Bread in the Eucharist,
chirid. Controv. "the whole Church for fif-
c. 8, p. 300. "teen hundred Years hath
 "been Idolatrous, and as many as have been
 "before us and adored this Sacrament, are
 "all Damned. You see he grants the thing,

that

that if there be nothing but Bread and Wine, &c. they are Idolaters, damnable Idolaters; but for his two Conclusions, That the whole Church for fifteen hundred Years hath been so, lieth upon his Friends to prove (this Worship came in long since.) or that supposing they were Idolaters, every one must be damned (that's another thing to be proved.)

I add, it is not only *guilty of Idolatry*, but the most *palpable and gross Idolatry*. *Idolatry is an Error about the Object of Divine Worship*; as to which we may see when we make any thing that is a Creature.

1. Either the *terminative Object*, so as our Worship endeth in it.

2. Or the *mediate Object* to which we give a Divine Worship, though not ultimately, but through and by it to the true God. This was the Idolatry of the *Golden Calf*, *Jeroboam* and *Micah*.

3. Or the *Commemorative Object* (which yet all will not grant Idolatry, though it hath a very ill appearance). As now suppose when one saw the Sun, he should presently fall down before it or bow, pretending he doth it not to the Sun but to the true God, only he maketh use of that noble Work of God, to put him in mind of the true God; and of his Homage to him; (as the wiser Papists say, their Images, and Crucifixes only put them in mind of God and Christ): Reason

will tell us, the first is *Crasseſſima Idololat-
ria*, the most gross and apparent Idolatry
imaginable; and such as I doubt whether
ever any Barbarians were guilty of (yea let
those that worshipped the host of Heaven,
The *Sun*, *Moon*, and *Stars*, being noble and
glorious bodys, and at such distance from
us, as we cannot come to a certain know-
ledge of their beings, and their influences
so very great and various, might (for ought
I know) be mistaken for the *supreme living
beings*; but for those that worshipped so-
lunars things, it will never enter into my
thoughts that they took them for *God*, the
supreme living being; but paid their ho-
mage to a *supreme living being*, of which
they had no true knowledge, in and by those
Creatures, in which they saw something
of his life and power exerted. But be that
as it will, as to these Idolaters and this
kind of Idolatry, there were certainly de-
grees in it; to judge of which this is a good
Rule,

By how much any creature is further off
from the *Divine Nature*, and being,
and we either do or may with the use of
our senses and reason know it to be so; by
so much the more gross our Idolatry is;
if we give an homage or worship to our,
which is only due or ought only to be gi-
ven to the true God.

We may pittie a blind Heathen, who
seeing

seeing the *Sun* or *Moon* such glorious Creatures, and observing what vast and various influences they have, and being not able to come at them by his senses to discern what kind of beings they are, nor hath had ingenious Education teaching him to use his reason to make up a judgment of them; shall fancy that they are living beings and Supreme beings, and therefore pay a divine homage and adoration to them: But if one shall take a stone, or a piece of wood, or bread, and give a divine homage to that, he is certainly a greater Idolater then the other; because he hath advantage by his Sense and Reason more to discern the remoteness of these things then the other, from any divine Being. Those two great Prophets, *Jeremiah*, *Jer.* 10. 3. and *Isaiah*, derided the Jewish madness in their Idolatry thus; *Isa.* 44. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17.

The Smith with the tongs both worketh in the coals, and fashioneth it with an hammer, and worketh it with the Strength of his Arme.—The Carpenter stretcheth it out with a rule; he marketh it out with a compass, and fitteth it with planes, and maketh it after the figure of a man, according to the beauty of a man, that it may remain in the house, he heweth him down Cedars and taketh the Cypress and the Oak; which he Strengthneth for himself amongst the trees of the Forrest: he planteth an Ash, and the rain doth

nourish it; then shall it be for a man to burn
 for he will take thereof and warm himself.
 yea he kindleth it and baketh Bread, yea he
 maketh a God, and worshippeth it; he maketh
 a graven Image, and falleth down thereon;
 he burneth part thereof in the fire, with part
 thereof he eateth Flesh; he roseth roste, and
 is satisfied; yea he warmeth himself, and
 saith Aha, I am warm, I have seen the Fire.
 And the residue thereof he maketh a God, a
 ven his graven Image; he falleth down, and
 worshippeth it, and prayeth unto it, and saith
 Deliver me, for thou art my God.

Let us try to make a parallel a little be-
 twixt the *Papists* and these brutish Idola-
 ters: The husband man buyeth his seed-
 wheat, this he soweth in his Field, when it
 is grown up he moweth or reapeth it with
 his sicke or sickle, and layeth it in his Barn,
 where the Mice and Ratts eat a part: the
 other part he beats out with his flayle, he
 winnoweth it with a fan, he lays it up in a
 Chamber; then he carrieth it to the Mill,
 the Miller grinds it in peices with stones,
 then the Baker taketh a part, which he
 worketh with the strength of his Armes,
 he moulds it, he fashioneth it, he heateth
 his Oven with fuell, he puts his dough into
 his Oven, he with part of it eateth his
 Flesh roste or boiled, with part he feeds his
 fowls, and part of it he carrieth to a Masse
 Priest, he lifts it up with his hands, and
 saith

saith *This is my Body*: presently the blind Papist falls down before it, kneels to it, (at the tinkling of a Bell), and cries out *A God*, and he prays to it, and saith *Deliver me, thou art my Saviour*.

Might the Jewish Idolaters have bin told by their own Senses, by the Smith and the Carpenter, that their graven Image could be no divine being? and may not the Papists be told the same, from the Husbandman, the Thresher, the Miller, the Baker, if they had no senses of their own? Oh, but I hear some whispering, 'tis no Idolatry because they think it is the true natural Body of Christ, and the Scripture seemeth at least to say so. Sol. The Bishop of Rochester had more wit then to think any thing of this Nature would excuse them; and therefore roundly confesseth, that if there be nothing but Bread in the Eucharist they are damnable adolaters. 2. Did ever any Idolaters in the world (think we) when they worshipped their Idols not think they worshipped the true God? 3. If any should fall down and worship every door, every lambe, &c. thinking they were Christ, and having the same colour of Scripture as in this Text, would his think so, or the phrase of Scripture, excuse his guilt think we? Surely they ought to think better, to use their Reason and Senses, and to compare Spiritual things with Spiritual: which if we

we doe, judge from what I have said, whether the *Papists* be not as gross Idolaters as are in the World? Idolatry sure hath more then a relative being to be measured by every ones Idle fancy.

2. But *Idolatry is not all their guilt* what you have heard will evince them guilty of *Blasphemy* as well as of *Idolatry*. Is it not *Blasphemy* to say, the *Body of Christ* is in part made up of bread? so it must be if the bread be not annihilated as *Bellarmino* saith is not, but turned into the flesh of Christ. If they say a *Priest* can make the body of Christ, If they say that *The body of Christ may breed Worms, &c.* Is not this blasphemy? but indeed they will not say so in *terminis*, therefore I shall charge them no further.

3. But Oh! what a bloody Synagogue are they! how much of the blood of innocents is found in the *Skirts of their whole Church*! if this you have heard be true what cruelty are they to be charged with. This was *Bonnors* killing question in *Queens Marys* days, do you believe that the body of Christ, that true natural body which he brought out of the womb of the *Virgin*, is in the *Sacrament*? or that the bread and wine in the *Sacrament* is turned into that very body? And because those better instructed and innocent Servants of God could not say, *Yes*, They cast them into coal-houses and prisons, burnt

their feet in the Stocks, famished them, burn'd them alive, dashed out their brains with Halbards, filled *England* with innocent blood: This very City had its share; was ever such cruelty heard of? was ever greater blood-guiltiness sticking to any nation? they spared neither learned nor unlearned, young nor old, men nor women, no not big with child, they had no pity of the fruit of their bodys: Surely in the skirts of this Synagogue is the blood of Innocents. And alas! how few were the drops of blood shed upon this account in *England*, in that five years time, to what was spilled before here, and for four or five hundred years, in other parts of the World! If the Lord abhorreth bloody men (as *Psal.* 5. 6.) if the blood-thirsty man shall be destroyed, *Psal.* 55. 22. surely their whole Church must be an abomination to the holy God, and their judgment sleepeth not; and with a very ordinary Spirit of Prophecy we may cry out to *Rome*, *Woe to thee thou bloody City, for God shall judge thee.* Surely every good Christian that valueth his Soul, will cry out to them, *Depart from me ye bloody men:* and we have all reason to repeat the Psalmists prayer, *Psal.* 59. 2. *Deliver us from [these] workers of iniquity, and save us from [these] bloody men.* And hence both the Popish Priest, and our apostatized or wambling Protestants, may make an answer to that question (with

which they so much trouble unstableSouls
 "Whether a man may not be saved in the com-
 "munion of the present Church of Rome?

Whether an ignorant person, walking
 in the simplicity of his heart amongst them
 and having never known better things, ne-
 bin able to judge of their abominations, ne-
 having had means to know them, serving
 God according to his light, may not
 saved? may possibly be a mute question.
 But whether one that hath bin bred up in
 Protestant Religion, in the knowledge of
 Scriptures, and under the clear sun-shine
 the Gospel, apostatizing from that profession
 and turning a renegado to them, knowing
 what they have done, and what they say, and
 hold living and dying in their communion, can
 be Saved? is a question, in the answer of
 which then can be no difficulty: while the
 Scripture tell us so plainly, that Idolatry
 shall never inherit the Kingdome of God
 1 Cor. 6. 9. and that Murderers and Ide-
 laters shall have their part in the lake which
 burneth with fire and Brimstone, Rev. 21. 8.
 It is a question in the affirmative of which
 it is fit for none to engage himself, but he
 who is prepared to assert, That the Scriptures
 are not the Word of God; for if they be,
 their judgment is plain enough, They cannot
 inherit the Kingdom of God.

3. And is this now a Religion? Is the
 Church of Rome, a Society fit for any who
 can read the Scriptures? Or who hath be-

instructed in the principles of Religion, to
joyn him or her Self unto? Have men ne-
ver read of the danger of *Idolatri*? Know
they not how the Scripture every where
compares it to *Whoredome*? Every where
denounceth the most formidable Judg-
ments of God against it? Have they never
read or heard of the cruell Sufferings of our
fore-fathers under these bloody men? Must
they voluntarily throw themselves into the
Society of those who slew those faithfull
Witnesses of God? Doe they understand
the guilt of blood so little; that they will pull
upon themselves the guilt of all that blood
that hath been shed from the blood of *John*
Hu & *Hierom* of *Prague* in *Germany*, to the
blood of those three Men and two Women
Martyred at *Canterbury*, No. 10. 1538.
(the last I think in *England* which Died un-
der their bloody hands)? If they be wea-
ry of their Religion, have they none to joyn
themselves unto but the grossest Idolaters,
such horrid Blasphemers, where the Crea-
ture pretends to make his Creator? yea,
to make a God of a piece of *Bakers Bread*,
and Eat him when they have done?
Ah, that any sensual, forelorne Souls should
Sin, to provoke God, to give them over to
such a decree of impiety, dotage, and delira-
tion. Is that a Religion fit for reasonable
man to be of, in which they must deny their
Reason and *Sense*? Nay rather let us hear
the

the Voice which Saint John heard from Heaven, Rev. 18. 4, 5. *Come out of her my People that you be not partakers of her Sins, and that you receive not of her Plagues: For her sins have reached unto Heaven, and God hath remembered her Iniquities.* And let us all, remembering the Blood of our Fore-father and the Blood of the Servants, the blessed Servants of God in other Countries, join our Cryes with the cryes of the Souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the Testimony which they held in this point, and say, *How long Lord, Holy and True, dost thou not judge and avenge our Blood on them that dwell on the Earth?*

Use. 2d. But (to conclude) though the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament be not (in this horrid and monstrous Sense) the Body and Blood of Christ, Yet there is truth in these Words, *This is my Body* They are, in another Sense, *The Body, and Blood of Christ.*

1. The Elements are true Signs of the Body and Blood of Christ.

2. The Ordinance is a true and admirable Meanes by which the benefit of the Body of Christ is conveyed to believers.

3. Upon your worthy receiving, you will also find it a Seal, not only of the Righteousness of Faith in the general (that is, of the truth of the Doctrine of the Gospel,) but of the Righteousness of Christ, made over to your Souls for

Remission of your Sins, upon the sacrifice of

I say first, The Elements are the true in-
 dicated Signes to signify and represent the Body
 and Blood of Christ. Thus the Bread is his
 Body, The Cup (the Wine in the Cup) is his
 Blood; as it is said of the sprinkling of the
 Levitical, and the two sides of the Posts of the
 Israelites Houses, Ex. 11. 27. It is the Sacra-
 ment of the Lords Passover; and of their Eating
 the Lamb, u. 11. It is the Lords Passover: as it
 is said, Christ is the true Wine, the good Shep-
 herd, *Manna*, &c. Here in a Figure Christ
 is Crucified before your Eyes; and this call-
 eth to you.

For your renewed Exercises of Repen-
 tance: Oh! Let your Eye affect your Heart;
 how will you look upon him whom your
 Heart Pierced, and not Mourn?

For your exercise of Faith, which is the
 Evidence of things not seen. That is the Eye
 which in the Ordinance must pass through
 the Vail of the Figures.

And for Love: Greater love than this
 that no man shew, then to Die for his Friend.
 Christ you see hath Died for you, while you
 were Enemies: his blood was the blood
 of Reconciliation; O love the Lord all you
 his redeemed ones.

2dly. The Ordinance is a sacred Admirable
 means Instituted by Christ by which the vertues
 and effects of his Death (so far as they concern

[illegible]